A Programme Evaluation Study: The Case of English Language Teaching Programme

Program Değerlendirme Çalışması: İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programı Örneği

Ayşegül OKUMUŞ[1] (iD) **, Ayşegül DALOĞLU**[2] (iD)

Abstract: This case study aims to contribute to the relevant literature as it is one of the first studies to evaluate the English language teaching programme launched by the Council of Higher Education in Türkiye in 2018 from the perspective of graduate students. The data were gathered through two questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The data analysis revealed the merits and aspects of the programme that need improvement and revision. The graduates reported their high and low competence in various areas. The ELT methodology component was deemed effective, whereas general culture courses were not found to be that effective. In other words, they stated that general culture courses made the least contribution to their teacher competencies, while ELT methodology courses made the biggest impact. The graduates suggested the following to improve the programme: more opportunities for teaching practice should be offered; the medium of instruction for general education and general culture courses should be English; there should be courses which can cultivate their emotional intelligence; and there should be more focus on inclusive and special education. The findings bear implications for the teacher educators who are in the process of revising the teacher education programme by the authority delegation decision made by CoHE in 2020.

Keywords: Programme Evaluation, English Language Teacher Education, Case Study, Graduates

<center>&</center>

Öz: Bu durum çalışması, Türkiye'de Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu tarafından 2018 yılında başlatılan İngilizce öğretmenliği programının mezun öğrencilerin bakış açısıyla değerlendiren ilk çalışmalardan biri olması sebebiyle ilgili alanyazına katkı sağlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Veriler, iki anket ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler programın iyileştirme ve revizyona ihtiyaç duyan özelliklerini ve yönlerini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Mezunlar, programın yeterli gördükleri ve gelişmeye açık yönlerini belirtmişlerdir. ELT metodolojisi bileşeni etkili bulunurken, genel kültür dersleri çok etkili bulunmamıştır. Başka bir deyişle, genel kültür derslerinin öğretmen yeterliklerine en az katkıyı, ELT metodolojisi derslerinin ise en büyük etkiyi yaptığını belirtmişlerdir. Mezunlar, programın iyileştirilmesine yönelik şu önerilerde bulunmuşlardır: öğretmenlik uygulaması için daha fazla fırsat sunulması, genel eğitim ve genel kültür derslerinin öğretim dilinin İngilizce olması, duygusal zekâlarını geliştirebilecek derslerin programa eklenmesi, kapsayıcı ve özel eğitime daha fazla odaklanılması. Bulgular, YÖK'ün 2020 yılında aldığı yetki devri kararına göre öğretmen eğitimi programını gözden geçirme sürecinde olan öğretmen eğitimcileri için çıkarımlar içermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Program Değerlendirme, İngilizce Öğretmeni Eğitimi, Durum Çalışması, Mezun

[1] Sorumlu Yazar: Araş. Gör. Ayşegül Okumuş, Başkent Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, aysegulokumus@baskent.edu.tr / aokumusbaskent@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5409-4880
[2] Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Daloğlu, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, daloglu@metu.edu.tr , https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9274-5952

1. INTRODUCTION

Training English language teachers has become a major concern as English has become the "lingua franca" (Crystal, 1997). To determine whether language teacher education programmes meet the needs of those who will teach English to the next generation, we must maintain programme evaluation (PE) as the primary component of teacher education programmes (Rea-Dickins & Germaine, 1998). To this end, according to Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005), language programme evaluation evolves to support programme improvement and ensure quality management. PE is defined by Robinson (2003, p. 199) as "the collection, analysis, and interpretation of information … for forming judgments about the value of a particular programme". She argued that the evaluation's objectives should be to inform stakeholders of different points of view regarding the program's value, assess how well it achieves its goals, and provide feedback on areas that require improvement.

In the context of evaluation, Türkiye, teacher education is carried out by higher education institutions that are governed by the Council of Higher Education (CoHE), which oversees organising, planning, recognising, and supervising all higher education institutions. Since the establishment, four reforms have been initiated in English language teacher education programmes (ELTEPs) in 1997-1998, 2006-2007, 2018-2019, and 2020, respectively (Gürel & Aslan, 2022). The rationale behind the curriculum changes in 2018 was indicated as follows: the structural changes in the education system (the paradigm shifts of 4+4+4 in 2012); the update of the "General Competencies for the Teaching Profession"; and the publication of the "Teacher Strategy Document of 2017-2023". The Turkish Ministry of Education (MoNE, 2017) updated the competency areas, namely professional knowledge, professional skills, and attitudes and values, that a qualified teacher should possess to ensure that prospective teachers are best prepared for their careers. In line with these competencies, in the 2018 curriculum, some content knowledge courses were removed, the names of some courses were changed, and some new courses were included (CoHE, 2018a; 2018b).

The PE studies on language teacher education programmes conducted in Türkiye on the 1998 and 2006 curriculums can be divided into two categories in that some evaluated the whole programme while others focused only on core components. First, some studies were conducted to evaluate the ELTEP curriculum initiated in 1998 (Şallı-Çopur, 2008) and in 2006 (Bilican, 2016; Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010; Çelik & Memduhoğlu, 2022; Demir, 2015; Eke & Razı, 2016; Gürler, 2018; Hişmanoğlu, 2012; Karakaş, 2012; Karabuğa, 2016; Özkahya, 2019; Salihoğlu, 2012; Sürüç-Şen & İpek, 2020; Uztosun & Troudi, 2015; Varol, 2018; Yavuz & Zehir Topyaka, 2013). Second, the 1998 English Language Teacher Education programme was evaluated in terms of language improvement courses (Erozan, 2005), methodology, and practice component (Gürbüz, 2006; Seferoğlu, 2006), while the 2006 curriculum was evaluated in terms of the practicum component (Celen & Akcan, 2017; Karslı & Yağız, 2022), research skills (Yavuz, 2018), educational and technological courses (Uzun, 2016), the pedagogical courses (Uzun, 2015), linguistics courses (Hatipoğlu, 2017), methodology courses (Coşkun, 2016), approaches and methods course (Atmaca, 2019), online practicum courses (Kazaz, 2022), and the materials, testing, and practicum courses (Ataş & Balıkçı, 2021). However, to the best knowledge of the researchers, although the 2006 curriculum has been extensively evaluated, no study has been conducted on the 2018 curriculum apart from the evaluation of the translation course (Bekereci-Şahin, 2022). Therefore, based on the call by Sürüç-Şen and İpek (2018) for an evaluation study of the undergraduate ELT programme in the 2018-2019 academic year, this study would be a valuable contribution to the field at the dawn of a curriculum redesign.

With the last reform in 2020, the faculties of education were granted the authority to design their own teacher education curriculum with the approval of CoHE (2020). This reform brought up the need to conduct a PE of the teacher education curriculum initiated in 2018 to make sound decisions while renovating and designing the new curriculum, which is not conducted nationwide. Therefore, each faculty of education is responsible for carrying out its own PE.

Within the scope of this study, the ELTEP, which is implemented at a foundation university located in Ankara, Türkiye, was evaluated. Enrolment in the programme is only possible if you obtain the required

score on the Basic Proficiency Test (*Temel Yeterlilik Testi*) and Field Proficiency Test (*Alan Yeterlilik Testi*) which is the Foreign Language Test (*Yabancı Dil Testi*) in English, which includes multiple-choice questions assessing students' level of English proficiency. It is a four-year programme that aims to prepare students to be English language teachers at the primary, secondary, and high school levels of either public or private schools. However, there is a one-year compulsory English preparatory education for all students if they do not pass the proficiency exam with 70 or provide a foreign language exam result (i.e., YDS, YÖKDİL). The programme accepts full-time undergraduate candidates who wish to teach English at the elementary, secondary, or tertiary levels. The course distribution by semester and year is presented in Appendix 1. Overall, the pedagogical knowledge courses make up 34 per cent of the programme, while 18 per cent is allocated to general culture courses (CoHE, 2018b). The courses specific to English language teacher education make up 48 per cent of the whole programme.

1.1. The aim of the study

The aim of this PE is twofold: to explore the strengths and weaknesses of the language teacher education programme conducted at a foundation university and receive feedback from the relevant stakeholders on how to improve the programme, and to provide feedback for making sound decisions while redesigning the teacher language education programme. To this end, this study scrutinises the following inquiries:

1. What aspects of the English Language Teaching programme should be maintained according to graduates?

2. What aspects of the English Language Teaching programme should be improved according to graduates?

1.2. The importance of the study

The current research can contribute to the niche in the body of literature on PE in teacher education. The PE has been highlighted as a significant component of teacher education programmes, even as "the heart of a programme" (Rea-Dickins & Germaine, 1998, p. 8). Although PE became a discipline quite some time ago (Fitzpatrick et al., 2011; Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005), there is a paucity of research in the field of teacher education (Freeman, 1996; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Grosse, 1991; Cepik & Polat, 2014). Additionally, with the authority delegation decision made in 2020 by CoHE (2020), the need to conduct a PE of the teacher education curriculum initiated in 2018 has arisen to make sound decisions while renovating and designing the new curriculum, which is not conducted nationwide. Therefore, each faculty of education is responsible for carrying out its own PE. Thus, this study also endeavours to contribute to the decision-making process in the curriculum redesign.

2. METHOD

2.1. Research design

This research embodies case study design as it focuses on *"the particularity and complexity of a single case"* (Stake, 1995, p. xi). The case in this study was the English Language Teaching Programme at a foundation university. The research is comprised of both qualitative and quantitative data gathered through surveys and interviews, respectively, to unveil the perceptions of the stakeholders, graduates, on the whole programme as suggested by Peacock (2009).

2.2. Participants

The ELTEP has a yearly intake of 55 students, and this number can go up to 65 with undergraduate transfer applications. They are required to complete 70 courses to be able to graduate (Appendix 1). The courses are categorised into four: university compulsory courses, professional education courses, departmental courses, and culture courses. The departmental courses can be categorised into three main areas, namely

English Language Teaching, linguistics, and literature. The programme under scrutiny has been accredited through an external evaluation carried out by the Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Teacher Education Programmes (EPDAD) in 2022.

The participants were 35 graduates who completed the 2018 curriculum at a foundation university and graduated in 2022. Some of them are working as English language teachers. The data were gathered online through semi-structured interviews and two questionnaires from those who are working as English language teachers. These instruments are explained in detail in the data collection section. An email was first sent to all the graduates (N= 35), 14 of whom were identified as currently working as English Language Teachers and were contacted through their phone numbers. As the participation in this study was on a voluntary basis, out of 14, twelve of them completed the questionnaires, and five of them took part in the semi-structured interviews. How long they have been teaching varied between three months and seven years, as they have been working while they were studying at the university. The majority have been working at the secondary level (N = 6) while four graduates have been working at primary schools. There were two working at language schools. All of them have been working at private schools. None of them has started their post-graduate studies yet. Only one of them attended in-service training at his institution.

2.3. Data collection and procedures

This research utilised three data-gathering instruments, which include two alumni questionnaires and an interview. All data were gathered online, and the procedures are explained in the following sections.

2.3.1. Alumni questionnaires

The viewpoints and suggestions of the graduates for improving the programme were gathered through two questionnaires, which were adapted from the questionnaires prepared by Şallı-Çopur (2008). In the first questionnaire, they provided not only demographic data (seven items) but also assessed their competencies in language and subject area (17 items), planning, teaching, and classroom management (19 items), monitoring, assessment, and professional development (14 items) through a four-point Likert scale (1: Incompetent; 2: Somewhat Competent; 3: Competent; 4: Highly Competent). They were also asked to indicate the problems they have been experiencing in teaching and what other competencies should be emphasised in the curriculum. In the second questionnaire, the graduates were expected to evaluate the courses in the curriculum regarding their contribution through a four-point Likert scale (1: very little; 2: little; 3: much; 4: very much). The questionnaire includes 88 Likert-type items and open-ended questions. After getting their consent, the questionnaires were shared through Google Forms with the graduates.

2.3.2. Alumni interviews

The viewpoints and suggestions of the graduates for improving the programme were also gathered through semi-structured interviews. The interview protocol was adapted from the alumni interview protocol prepared by Şallı-Çopur (2008). The interview was carried out online in English via MS Teams and was audio recorded for data analysis purposes. The interviews lasted for 32 minutes on average. After getting their consent, the participants were assigned pseudonyms to eliminate any ethical concerns.

2.4. Data analysis

Through descriptive analysis of the quantitative data using SPSS version 25, mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and percentages were calculated. After the qualitative data had been verbatim transcribed, it was analysed using the constant comparative method based on the interviews and open-ended questions in the questionnaire (Creswell & Poth, 2016). Each code that was extracted from the data collection was compared to the other codes that were emerging in the data. Then, by thoroughly analysing the data, emerging codes were converted into themes (Creswell, 2009). The researcher and a colleague independently coded the data to ensure the validity of the data analysis process. A sample coding is provided in Appendix 2. The intercoder reliability was found to be .095, which is sufficient for agreement among multiple coders (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Additionally, triangulation was employed in this study

in that it was defined as "the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behaviour" (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 112). The use of two data-gathering methods from two research traditions—quantitative and qualitative—was addressed by methodological triangulation to increase the validity of the results.

2.5. Ethical approval

In this study, all the rules specified to be followed within the scope of the "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were complied with. None of the actions specified under the heading "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics," which is the second part of the directive, have been taken.

Ethics Committee Approval Information:

Ethical committee: Social and Humanities Scientific Research and Art Field Ethics Committee

Data of ethical approval: 23.05.2023

The number of ethical approval: 17162298.600-145

3. Findings

This study sought to conduct a PE of an ELTEP from the perspective of graduates. The findings are presented under five main headings, respectively.

1. Findings on Alumni Questionnaire 1

The graduates evaluated their own level of competence in three areas: language and subject area, planning, teaching and classroom management, monitoring, assessment, and professional development. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics for their competency in language and subject area. They indicated that they are mostly competent in language knowledge, as the mean scores for items from one to four are higher than 3.50. As for their subject area knowledge, they indicated both their competence and high competence. While they were highly competent in teaching macro-skills and listening subskills, they were not highly competent in linguistic and foreign language teaching theories and methods, in improving learners' reading subskills, and integrating form, function, and meaning in grammar teaching.

Table 1.

The Graduates' Competence in Language & Subject Area

As a teacher of English, how competent are you in …?	M	SD
1. Having advanced knowledge of English	3.50	.522
2. Using (and understanding) the English language communicatively	3.75	.452
3. Being an adequate model of the English language for students	3.75	.452
4. Understanding and using the English language appropriate to the situation and level	3.67	.492
5. Integrating form, function and meaning for grammar teaching	3.33	.651
6. Presenting knowledge of the language in a clear, simple and stimulating manner	3.50	.522
7. Developing learners' vocabulary knowledge	3.50	.522
8. Developing learners' subskills (i.e.: inference) that assist reading comprehension in English	3.17	.835

Table 1.

The Graduates' Competence in Language & Subject Area (Continued)

As a teacher of English, how competent are you in …?	M	SD
9. Developing learners' subskills (i.e.: note taking) that assist listening comprehension in English	3.50	.670
10. Developing learners' subskills (i.e.: drafting) that assist written production in English	3.25	.754
11. Developing learners' subskills (i.e.: intonation) that assist spoken production in English	3.42	.699
12. Integrating macro language skills (Reading, Listening, Writing and Speaking)	3.67	.492
13. Having knowledge of general linguistic theory (i.e.: description of languages)	3.00	.603
14. Having knowledge of foreign language teaching theories and methods	3.17	.937
15. Selecting and using suitable approaches, procedures, and techniques appropriate to the foreign language point	3.33	.778
16. Employing a range of teaching strategies suited to learner age (young learners, teenagers, adults)	3.42	996
17. Employing a range of teaching strategies suited to learner ability and proficiency level (beginner to advanced)	3.50	.674

The results of the graduates' planning, teaching, and classroom management skills are shown in Table 2. The highest mean score (M = 3.92) was found for responding to students' questions. All the participants believed they were competent at using information technology. They also indicated their high competence in knowing the teaching curriculum, asking timely questions, and establishing rapport with students. However, they reported their slightly low competence in time management and using teaching-learning facilities.

Table 2.

The Graduates' Competence in Planning, Teaching, and Classroom Management

As a teacher of English, how competent are you in …?	M	SD
1. Knowing the foreign language teaching curriculum of the school you teach	3.75	.452
2. Making appropriate plans concerning students' needs	3.50	.674
3. Expressing objectives the students will achieve clearly	3.50	.674
4. Preparing structural and coherent lesson plans to achieve course objectives	3.42	.669
5. Establishing good connections with previous and following topics	3.58	.515
6. Preparing and using a variety of teaching-learning activities related to the aims of the lesson and students' needs	3.67	.492
7. Selecting and using appropriate and available sources related to aims of the lesson and students' needs	3.58	.515
8. Selecting and using examples relating the topic to real life	3.58	.669
9. Using teaching learning facilities effectively (i.e.: language lab, library)	3.25	.965
10. Making use of information technology (i.e.: audio-visuals, electronic devices and computer)	3.83	.389
11. Adjusting instructions and explanations to students' needs, age and level	3.50	.674
12. Asking students timely and effective questions	3.75	.452
13. Responding to students' questions	3.92	.289

Table 2.

The Graduates' Competence in Planning, Teaching, and Classroom Management (Continued)

As a teacher of English, how competent are you in …?	M	SD
14. Developing students' interest in the lesson (i.e.: motivating students towards the course)	3.58	.669
15. Using class time effectively	3.17	.937
16. Using voice effectively and varying it to attract students' attention during the lesson	3.58	.515
17. Responding to student feedback (i.e.: students' opinion about an activity)	3.58	.669
18. Selecting and using individual, small group and whole class teaching methods appropriate to the class	3.58	.515
19. Establishing rapport with learners (i.e.: building positive relationship)	3.75	.452

Findings on the graduates' monitoring, evaluation, and professional development skills are shown in Table 3. Even though the graduates demonstrated lower levels of competence in assessment-related items, they indicated their high competence in giving feedback to learners. Nevertheless, they stated they were competent in continuous professional development and reflecting on their performance for self-improvement.

Table 3.

The Graduates' Competence in Monitoring, Assessment and Professional Development

As a teacher of English, how competent are you in …?	M	SD
1. Knowing a variety of assessment methods	3.00	.853
2. Using assessment methods relevant to the subject effectively	3.33	.778
3. Planning assessment in parallel with course objectives	3.33	.778
4. Monitoring student learning in different classroom activities	3.58	.515
5. Evaluating students' progress in relation to the aims of the lesson consistently	3.42	.515
6. Keeping careful records of students' progress	3.42	.793
7. Diagnosing students' failure and difficulties	3.42	.515
8. Giving necessary and useful feedback to the students	3.75	.452
9. Working cooperatively with professional colleagues and/or parents in forwarding observation and evaluation results	3.42	.793
10. Fulfilling the legal, social and administrative responsibilities at school	3.67	.492
11. Carrying out responsibilities for the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of the students	3.58	.669
12. Contributing to school activities such as meetings, in-service teacher training and materials preparation sessions	3.42	.996
13. Being open to consistent professional development	3.75	.452
14. Reflecting on your performance for self- development	3.67	.492

2. The Effect of ELTE Programme Components

In this part, the findings based on the second alumni questionnaire and interview data are presented to reveal the impact of ELTE programme components on the graduates. The findings are presented for compulsory and elective courses. The six components can be ranked from highest to lowest as follows: ELT Methodology (M=3.62), Language (M=3.26), Linguistics (M=3.25), General Education (M=3.05), Literature

(M=2.97), and General Culture (M=2.28). The interview questions centre on the ELTE program's components and how these components affect graduates' language teaching competencies. The graduates were asked which of these elements was/were more effective than the others. Two graduates cited the ELT methodology component as the most crucial element of the programme. One said, *"ELT courses are more important than I think general cultural courses because uh, just in English language teaching courses, … they teach you the bedrocks of the English language teaching." (I1).* Another graduate indicated that *"language teaching courses are the most important because they teach you how to teach English, I mean it is like how to say it is exactly what I wanted to learn when I, you know, came to my university to study language teaching." (I2).* However, according to three interviewees, each element is equally important because each one complements the others. One graduate commented, "*Each heading has its own unique benefit and importance. I can't say one is more important or less important. All of them provide a different dynamic for this profession. So, if we consider this profession a bridge, these six main headings are legs that keep it afloat. That's why it's all so important. For a teacher, it is also a success to be able to cross that bridge." (I5).* The other elements were also mentioned, but for various factors and in various rankings of importance. As one graduate noted, "*also with general education courses as well when they taught me the history of education, (I5)*" the general education component was thought to be a crucial part of the programme. Besides, regarding language courses, one interviewee stated, *"I can understand why these, .. courses are put in the curriculum as well because not everybody is proficient in English … So I can understand the point of.. putting these courses in the curriculum, but they did not help me improve myself that much." (I5).* The linguistics component was thought to be one of its fundamental components. Finally, the literature component was also regarded as a crucial component because it fosters their intellectual growth. In the following part, the graduates' views on each component of the programme are presented.

2.1. Language Component

This part includes the perspectives of the graduates on language skills courses. The courses can be ranked from the most successful to the least successful as follows: The Structure of English (M=3.58), Oral Communications Skills (M=3.50), Reading Skills (M=3.42), Listening and Pronunciation (M=3.42), Critical Reading and Writing (M=3.33), Writing Skills (M=3.05), Translation (M=3), and English in Mass Media (M=2.75).

Table 4.

ELT Graduates' Views on The Contribution of Language Component Courses

Courses	M	SD	Courses	M	SD
1.Reading Skills I & II (C)	3.42	.793	5.Structure of English (C)	3.58	.793
2.Oral Communication Skills I & II (C)	3.50	.905	6.Critical Reading and Writing (C)	3.33	.985
3.Writing Skills I & II (C)	3.08	.900	7.Translation (C)	3.00	1.279
4.Listening and Pronunciation I & II (C)	3.42	.996	8. English in Mass Communication (E)	2,75	1,215

Compulsory: C; Elective: E

Their opinions from the interview are shown in Table 5 for the Language component. Two graduates emphasised that the Critical Reading and Writing course was effective for them when it came to language skills. One graduate claimed that these courses allowed them to practise and improve their English. Two also mentioned how these classes improved their ability to communicate and their intelligibility. Two graduates even stated that these courses have served as a model for their lesson planning. Only one graduate, who was already quite proficient when he began the programme, pointed out that these courses did not affect his language abilities. Two graduates also thought there should be more language-related courses offered. Two graduates, however, claimed that the number of courses was adequate. However, one suggested that "*the second course is in the second term, should be more advanced." (I2).* One graduate posited that "(receptive skills) *should be more emphasized because I think I think language learning starts with these skills." (I3),* whereas another graduate suggested that the course hours of speaking classes should be increased.

Another graduate suggested that *"It would be perfect if it were updated only according to the period's innovations." (I5)*

Table 5. *The Graduates' Views on Language Component Courses*

Code (Positive)	*f*
Made use of critical reading and writing course	2
Served as a model for lesson planning	2
Contributed to communication skills	2
Practicing and improving English	1
Learning how to be intelligible	1
Code (Negative)	*f*
No use of the language skills courses	1

2.2. Linguistics Component

This part includes the views of the graduates on linguistics courses. Table 6 reveals that the courses can be listed from the most effective to the least effective in the following order: Language Acquisition (M= 3.58), Language and Society (M=3,42), Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching (M=3,25), Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching (M=3,25), Linguistics I & II (M=3,17), Pragmatics and Language Teaching (M=3,17), and World Englishes and Culture (M=2.92).

Table 6.
The ELT Graduates' Views on The Contribution of Linguistics Component Courses

Compulsory Courses	M	SD	Elective Courses	M	SD
Linguistics I & II	3.17	.718	World Englishes and Culture	2.92	1,240
Language Acquisition	3.58	.793	Language and Society	3,42	,996
			Pragmatics and Language Teaching	3,17	1,030
			Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching	3,25	1,055
			Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching	3,25	1,055

According to the interview data (See Table 7), three graduates said their English improved because of their linguistics coursework. Similar to this, its importance to language accuracy is emphasised by one graduate, *"it helps you speak much more correctly with the help of phonology and morphology." (I1).* Two claimed that these courses served as a model for them in explaining the grammar rules and word formation to their learners as they learn how to *"explain the components of English language structures"* and indicated *"how important linguistic courses when it comes to the teaching of word" (I1).* One student, however, claimed that these courses did not improve their competencies. Another graduate noted that *"everything was hard to remember" (I4).* While one graduate felt that the linguistics courses were sufficient in terms of the number of courses, another graduate suggested that there should be more. One suggested that rather than just lecturing during this course, the instructor can share their own previous experiences in relation to the content.

Table 7.

The Graduates' Views on the Linguistics Component

Positive	*f*
Contribution to knowledge	3
Model in explaining grammar rules	2
Model in explaining word formation	1
Contribute to language accuracy	1
Negative	*f*
No contribution to teacher competency	1
Difficulty in remembering the concepts	1

2.3. Literature Component

This part includes the graduates' views on literature courses. As shown in Table 8, no course had a mean score of more than 3.50. Drama in English language teaching received the highest mean score (M= 3.33), followed by Teaching Language and Literature I/II (M=2.92) and English Literature I/II (M=2.67).

Table 8.

ELT Graduates' Views on The Contribution of Literature Component Courses

Compulsory Courses	M	SD	Elective Courses	M	SD
English Literature I & II	2.67	.985	Drama in English Language Teaching	3,33	,888
Teaching Language and Literature I & II	2.92	.900			

According to interview data (See Table *9*), three graduates said that the literature classes helped them advance their knowledge and professional development in that one graduated said, *"In order to grasp the fundamentals of English language and cultural background, a teacher must have the literature knowledge" (I3).* One stated that his instructor is competent, which helped him discover new signs of English literature. One graduate felt that these courses improved her ability to plan lessons, while another said, "*I wouldn't say it contributed to my lesson planning or classroom management knowledge." (I1).* they did not affect their ability to plan lessons or manage their classroom. Regarding the number of courses, two graduates said that they had taken enough literary studies because ELT was their major rather than literature. "*I would have loved it if we had more literature courses*" *(I2)*, one student said, highlighting his interest in literature. One recommendation is to include "Mythology" courses into the curriculum as a compulsory course. Lastly, one graduate emphasised that *"Especially English teachers need to learn how to teach this lesson, how to make students study the texts. It would be better if we received training on how to teach this course..." (I5).*

Table 9.

The Graduates' Views on Literature Component

Code (Positive)	*f*
Contribute to knowledge and professional development	3
Competent instructors	1
Contribution to lesson planning	1
Code (Negative)	*f*
No contribution to lesson planning or classroom management	1

.2.4. ELT Methodology Component

This part includes the graduates' views on the ELT methodology component. According to Table 10, all the graduates reported the contribution of this component to their competencies in the following order from the highest to the lowest: Teaching Practise I (M=3.92); Teaching English Language Skills II, Teaching Practise II, and Material Design in ELT (M=3.83); Teaching English to Young Learners I/II, Teaching English Language Skills I, English Language Teaching Programmes, Approaches to English Language Learning

and Teaching, and Teaching English Language Skills I (M=3.75); Teaching Integrated Language Skills (M=3.58); English Language Testing and Assessment, Course Content Development in ELT, English Coursebook Evaluation (M=3.50); Current Approaches to Teaching English (M=3.42); Classroom-based Language Assessment (M=3.25); Teaching English Lexicon (M=3.17).

Table 10.

ELT Graduates' Views on The Contribution of ELT Methodology Component Courses

Compulsory Courses	M	SD	Elective Courses	M	SD
Approaches to English Language Learning and Teaching	3,75	,452	Teaching English Lexicon	3,17	1,030
Teaching Foreign Language to Young Learners I & II	3,75	,452	Current Approaches to Teaching English	3,42	,793
Teaching English Language Skills I	3,75	.452	Teaching Integrated Language Skills	3,58	,669
Teaching English Language Skills II	3,83	,389	Material Design in ELT	3,83	,389
English Language Teaching Programs	3,75	.452	English Coursebook Evaluation	3,50	,674
Course Content Development in ELT	3,50	,674	Classroom Based Language Assessment	3,25	,965
English Language Testing and Assessment	3,50	,674			
Teaching Practice I	3,92	,289			
Teaching Practice II	3,83	,389			

As for the interview data, Table 11 summarises their opinions, which were divided into positive and negative categories. The graduates reported that these courses had a significant impact on their competency in lesson planning (f = 4), "*how to integrate and plan assessments in line with the objectives*" *(I1)* (f = 2), classroom management (f = 2), and professional development (f = 1). Regarding the number of courses, one graduate said "*I think they were. Let's say very close to being perfect, I think there was a right number of courses but there you know right amount of content.*" *(I2).* Nonetheless, one pointed out that "*...theoretical courses are are really predominant as opposed to the practical courses.*" *(I3).* Therefore, he suggested that "*I think the number of the practical courses should be increased.*" (I3) because they "*provide a real-life experience.*" *(I5).*

Table 11.

The Graduates' Views on the ELT Methodology Component

Code (Positive)	*f*
Lesson planning	4
Assessing learners	2
Classroom management	2
Professional development	1
Code (Negative)	*f*
The number of theoretical courses	1

2.5. General Education Component

Table 12.

ELT Graduates' Views on the Contribution of General Education Component Courses

Compulsory Courses	M	SD	Compulsory Courses	M	SD
Introduction to Educational Sciences	3,17	1,030	History of Turkish Education	2,50	1,243
Educational Sociology	3,17	1,030	Classroom Management	3,67	,492
Information Technologies	3,17	1,193	Ethics and Morality in Education	2,83	1,467
Educational Psychology	3,00	1,206	Measurement and Evaluation in Education	3,00	1.206
Educational Philosophy	2.83	1,193	Turkish Educational System and School Management	2,75	1,422
Principles and Methods of Instruction	3,42	,793	Special Education and Mainstream	3.08	1,379
Research Methods in Education	3,08	1,165	Guidance at Schools	3,08	1,084
Instructional Technologies	3,17	1,193			

This part includes the graduates' views on general education and professional elective courses. As provided in Table 12 above, the graduates ranked these courses according to their contribution to their teaching competence from the most effective to the least in the following order: Classroom management (M=3.67); Principles and Methods of Instruction (M= 3.42); Introduction to Educational Sciences, Educational Sociology, Information Technologies, Instructional Technologies (M=3.17); Research Methods in Education, Special Education and Mainstream, Guidance at Schools (M=3.08); Educational Psychology, Measurement and Evaluation in Education (M=3.00); Educational Philosophy, Ethics and Morality in Education (M=2.83); Turkish Educational System, and School Management (M=2.75), and The History of Turkish Education (M=2.50).

Table 13.

ELT Graduates' Views on Professional Elective Component Courses

Elective Courses	M	SD	Elective Courses	M	SD
Open and Distance Learning	3,42	,900	Character and Value Education	3,25	1,215
Child Psychology	3,25	,866	Inclusive Education	2,75	1,215
Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder	2.92	1,165	Adult Education and Lifelong Learning	3.00	1,248
Educational Law	3,08	1,240	Comparative Education	2,75	1,288
Educational Anthropology	2,58	1,240	Micro Teaching	3,58	,900
History of Education	2,83	1,115	Designing Projects in Education	3,33	1,155
Drama in Education	3,08	,996	Learning Difficulties	3,00	1,128
Extracurricular Activities in Education	3,50	,905	Individualising and Adaptation of Instruction	3,08	1,240
Curriculum Development in Education	3,50	,905	Out-of -School Learning Environments	3,25	1,215
Sustainable Development and Education	3.00	1,477	Education of Hospitalised Children	2,67	1,371
Critical and Analytical Thinking	2.92	1,311	Museum Education	2,50	1,567

Regarding the professional elective courses listed in Table 13 above, their ranking in terms of their contribution to the graduate's teacher competencies is as follows: Microteaching (M=3.58); Extracurricular Activities in Education and Curriculum Development in Education (M=3.50); Open and Distance Learning (M=3.42); Designing Projects in Education (M=3.33); Child Psychology, Character and Value Education,

Out-of-School Learning Environments (M=3.25); Educational Law, Drama in Education, Individualising and Adaptation of Instruction (M=3.08); Adult Education and Lifelong Learning, Learning Difficulties, Sustainable Development and Education (M=3.00); Critical and Analytical Thinking, Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (M=2.92); History of Education (M=2.83); Inclusive Education, Comparative Education (M=2.75); Education of Hospitalised Children (M=2.67); Educational Anthropology (M=2.58), Museum Education (M=2.50).

As for the interview data in Table 14, one graduate indicated that "*general education courses were one of the most contributing ones for my growth as a teacher." (I2).* Another graduate claimed that these courses were instrumental in teaching her how to maintain positive relationships with her students by stating, "*These lessons taught me how to treat students in class, how to get along with troubled students, or how to show patience to these students.*" *(I5).* However, as they preferred English as the medium of instruction, they indicated that "*The reason why I hate these courses are because they are conducted in Turkish language*." *(I1).* They said "*…they were also one of the most boring lessons*." *(I2)* and the material was not interesting. The graduates claimed that these courses had no bearing on their lesson planning or professional development because they were not teaching-based. Concerning classroom management, a graduate said that he relied more on his judgment than what his instructor had taught him. "*I don't think there's enough class regarding the special education…*" *(I1)*, one graduate further highlighted. As a result, he recommended that special education be covered in more than one course. In relation to this, another graduate emphasised that "*There needs to be more education about how we can move forward with students who are problematic or who really need attention." (I5).* Finally, the number of courses was claimed to be more than sufficient and that their numbers can even be decreased.

Table 14.

The Graduates' Views on the General Education Component

Code (Positive)	*f*
Contribution to teacher competencies	1
Maintaining good rapport with learners	1
Code (Negative)	*f*
Medium of instruction	2
Not engaging content	2
No contribution to lesson planning	1
No contribution to professional development	1
No contribution to classroom management	1
Lack of focus on special education	1

2.6. General Culture Component

This part includes the graduates' views on general culture courses. The last section includes the General Culture courses, which had the lowest mean score in total (See Table 15). Their ranking from the most effective to the least was as follows: Quality in Education (M=3.17); Education of Human Rights and Democracy and Academic English (M=3.08); Culture and Language (M=3.00); Human Relations and Communication and Media Literacy (M=2.75); Art and Aesthetics (M=2.58); Science and Research Ethics and Career Planning and Development (M=2.33); Addiction and Fighting with Addiction (M=2.17); History and Philosophy Of Science (M=2.08); Nutrition and Health (M= 2.00); Economy and Entrepreneurship, History of Turkish Art (M= 1.92); Traditional Turkish Handicraft, Turkish Folk Dances (M=1.75); Turkish Cultural Geography (M=1.67); Turkish Music (M=1.58); and Turkish Sign Language (M=1.50).

Table 15.

The ELT Graduates' Views on General Culture Elective Component Courses

Courses	M	SD	Courses	M	SD
1. Addiction and Fighting with Addiction	2.17	1.193	11. Media Literacy	2.75	1.215
2. Nutrition and Health	2.00	1.044	12. Academic English	3.08	1.084
3. History and Philosophy of Science	2.08	1.084	13. Art and Aesthetics	2.58	1.379
4. Science and Research Ethics	2,33	.985	14. Turkish Folk Dances	1.75	1.138
5. Economy and Entrepreneurship	1.92	1.311	15. Turkish Sign Language	1.50	.905
6. Traditional Turkish Handicraft	1.75	1.055	16. Turkish Cultural Geography	1.67	.985
7. Education of Human Rights and Democracy	3.08	1.165	17. Turkish Music	1.58	.996
8. Human Relations and Communication	2.75	1.357	18. History of Turkish Art	1.92	1.240
9. Career Planning and Development	2.33	1.073	19. Quality in Education	3.17	1.115
10. Culture and Language	3.00	.953			

In the interviews (see Table 16), two graduates indicated that these courses enriched their cultural knowledge by saying, *"a teacher must have the knowledge of general culture because while teaching, forming a link between the general culture and the English language and stating cultural ideas with the English language plays an important role." (I3).* These courses, like general education courses, did not, however, have interesting content. Rather, they reported, *"Courses like science and research…I think we have like the same content in three different courses" (I4)* as some content was similar to the general education courses. Therefore, these courses were quite repetitive. One graduate even remarked, *"These lessons obviously did not contribute much to my teaching life." (I5).* Additionally, they stated that they preferred that these classes be taught in English. Finally, one graduate claimed that some courses' content was not so extensive that it could not be covered in a 14-week semester. Therefore, he proposed that these courses be conducted in four weeks and then move on to another course. Alternately, the related courses could be combined into one.

Table 16.

The Graduates' Views on the General Culture Component

Code (Positive)	*f*
Contributing to cultural knowledge base	2
Code (Negative)	*f*
Not engaging content	2
Repetitive content	1
Medium of instruction	1

4. The ELTEP Graduates' Strengths and Competencies They Need to Further Develop

4.1. The Graduates' Strengths

During the interview, the graduates were asked to express their strengths in terms of teacher competencies. As shown in Table 17, a small number of graduates highlighted their competencies in a variety of areas. Two graduates claimed that they felt qualified to teach English because they could modify their language in accordance with the learner's profile. One graduate stated, *"I will say I'm good at lesson planning because I had lots of opportunities." (I1).* Additionally, contributing to this competency was their competence in material design. One graduate also said, *"I would also say time management is like a good competence that I find myself very successful" (I1).* Two graduates identified teaching *"about more complex grammar structures"* (I2) (*f* = 2) and *"developing my students' vocabulary knowledge" (I4)* (*f* = 1) as their areas of strength. One indicated,

"I found myself successful in … using teaching learning facilities" (I4) (f = 1) and adaptability (*f* = 1) as areas in which they feel competent. Two graduates also mentioned that they get along well with students (*f* = 2) as exemplified by the following statement, *"So I think I am very competent when it comes to teacher student interactions"* (I2). Lastly, one graduate indicated that *"I see myself as I am competent enough especially in terms of preparing material and classroom management. (I3) (f* = 1).

Table 17.

The Strengths of ELTE Graduates

Codes	*f*
Teaching English	2
Lesson planning	2
Adaptability	1
Teaching grammar	2
Teaching vocabulary	1
Good rapport with students	2
Time-management	1
Classroom management	1
Material Design	2
Using teaching learning facilities	1

4.2. The Graduates' Competencies They Need to Further Develop

The graduates were asked to list the competencies they feel they need to improve further (See Table 18).

Table 18.

The Graduates' Competencies They Need to Further Develop

Code (Classroom management)	*f*	Code (Improving field knowledge)	*f*
Time management	3	Assessing learner	2
Being patient	2	Teaching grammar	2
Using voice effectively	2	Teaching writing (including subskills)	2
Classroom management	1	Good command over spoken English	2
Anticipating potential issues	1	Improving knowledge of general linguistic theory	1
Engaging learners	1	Improving theoretical knowledge	1
Improving body language (i.e. posture)	1	Explaining objectives to learners	1
How to motivate learners	1	Adapting learning to learner profile	1
Being tolerant towards young learners	1	Material Design	1
Code (Other)	***f***		
Cultivating learners' emotional intelligence	2		
Creativity	1		

Regarding classroom management, the graduates said, *"Sometimes I also have problems with time management due to my desire to deal with students." (Q, P9) (f*=3) and "*I guess I have to learn to be more patient, especially with young children" (Q, P5) (f*=2). In the same regard, one graduate highlighted being tolerant towards young learners by saying, *"I should be more understanding to the students. Since I teach 1st grade sometimes when they don't listen I get mad easily and raise my voice." (Q, P8).* According to two graduates, effectively using their voices was yet another area that needed improvement. One was about foreseeing potential issues. Another graduate emphasised the significance of keeping students interested throughout the entire lesson. Another graduate suggested that teachers should adopt better posture and body language by saying, *"I should fix my posture." (Q, P6).* It is also suggested that there is room for improvement in motivating students. Aspects related to subject-matter expertise were identified as the competencies that needed to be improved in the

second category. Two graduates mentioned assessing students. One mentioned, "*Integrating form, function, and meaning for teaching grammar*" *(Q, P2).* Another suggestion from a graduate was "*developing learners' subskills that assist written production in English*" *(Q, P2).* One indicated, "I need to improve myself in terms of general linguistic theory" *(Q, P7).* Regarding good command over spoken English (*f*=2), one graduate stated, *"I need to improve my ability to speak English more fluently and well, especially in class."* (I5) and another said, "*I think I need to improve myself in terms of knowledge of intonation and emphasis rules in words while speaking English*." *(Q, P7).* One emphasised expanding their theoretical understanding. Another graduate had difficulty *"explaining the objectives to learners clearly" (Q, P10).* Material design was another area for further development. In the third category, two graduates emphasised the significance of developing students' emotional intelligence. One said they could sharpen their creativity.

5. The Graduates' Suggestions for the ELTE Programme

This part focuses on the competencies that are not on the list but are valued highly by the respondents and their suggestions for improving the ELTE programme.

As presented in Table 19, the graduates provided eleven recommendations. Two graduates emphasised the importance of having effective parent communication skills by saying, "*communication with parents is as important of a competence for not only an English teacher, but any teacher plays a great a role as it is something I greatly struggle with." (Q, P2).* The graduates also emphasised special education because they needed to be equipped to recognise any learning challenges that their students might experience. One graduate emphasised inclusive education by stating, "*As we are living in a country where we live with a racially mixed people. As a teacher we need to be equal and inclusive towards everyone*." *(Q, P10).* One graduate also indicated that they need to maintain good contact with learners (*f*=1) in that they will be mentoring them throughout their language learning journey (*f*=1). One stated, "*… the teacher has knowledge of authentic examples about the subject to be taught and prepares and revises examples from authentic texts according to the age and English level of the students*." *(Q, P7).* Another graduate said, "B*eing resourceful is a great skill that we have to have in a business world and we never know how many things we need to complete in a tight schedule." (Q, P10).* According to this advice, they must also be adaptable and willing to change when needed. One graduate stressed the significance of developing emotional competence to be able to handle any difficulties and workload. Another suggestion was that for the learning process to be successful, "*communication with teachers in the school" (Q, P12)* is crucial. Finally, one added that they feel they must teach to the test ("*exam such as yks, lgs preparation competence" (Q, P12)*) because that is what their respective institutions expect, and that they need to improve their exam preparation skills. Four graduates emphasised the need for more hands-on instruction, such as microteaching, prior to teaching practice so that students would be ready for their future work. Regarding the number of practice-based courses, one indicated *"I think the number of practical courses can be increased because like being a teacher is like like something practical like like you learn by doing it." (I4).* One even said, "I think if I had any chances to do macro chat, micro teachings in my in my second year, maybe first year, maybe third year, I will be much more. I would I I would have had much more experience*." (I1).* One also suggested regarding student selection, arguing that if the students are not capable of becoming teachers, it serves no purpose to give them a high-quality education because they will not be employing it. That is why one argued that the student selection system needs to change as well, saying *"So yeah, I think we should focus more on choosing more qualified people. Um, I mean, they think about it, I have seen. Heard and. So many people who did not know English that were graduating. So I think this is kind of a debunking the whole 'we are giving quality education.'" (I2).*

Table 19.

The Graduates' Recommendation for ELTEP

Codes	*f*
Having good communication skills with parents	2
Focusing on special education	1
Focusing on inclusive education	1
Getting on well with learners	1
Improving guidance skills	1
Having knowledge about authentic examples to support learning and learners	1
Cultivating on emotional competence	1
Being flexible	1
Being resourceful	1
Communicating with colleagues	1
Teaching to the test	1
Offering more opportunities for practice	4
Changing the student selection for the programme	1

4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

4.1. Discussion and conclusion

The purpose of the current study was to determine whether the 2018 ELTE programme was successful and satisfied the needs of its graduates. For discussion, the conclusions drawn from the graduates using various data collection techniques are compared.

Considering the findings, teacher candidates feel as competent as they can be in the three competency domains such as language and subject area, material design, and lesson planning. This result is consistent with earlier studies that evaluated programmes (Bilican, 2016; Şallı-Çopur, 2008; Varol, 2018). Despite expressing a high level of competence in these areas, they acknowledged that they still needed to develop their classroom management and assessment skills. While the majority claimed to be very competent at explaining the lesson's objectives, one graduate also mentioned having trouble explaining it to the students, which is consistent with the conclusion made by Eke and Razı (2016). In a way, this shows their limited practical experience in a real classroom environment due to distance education. Additionally, they indicated that they felt less qualified to develop the reading and writing subskills of learners, which is supported by the conclusions drawn from the qualitative data. According to the graduates who participated in the interviews, these results can be partially attributed to the fact that they took online micro-teaching courses during the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite this, they claimed that they felt competent in lesson planning, which supports what Gürbüz (2006) found that student teachers were found to have strengths in putting together lectures that were enjoyable and well-organized as well as materials that were logical and appealing to the students. When they began face-to-face instruction in their senior year, remedial teaching was implemented to make up for this loss by providing micro-teaching courses as electives (Teaching Integrated Language Skills and Microteaching). However, it appears that this was insufficient to foster their teaching skills, which is also highlighted as the lack of practice opportunities in earlier studies (Coşkun & Daloğlu, 2010; Erozan, 2005; Karabuğa, 2016; Peacock, 2009; Salihoğlu, 2012; Seferoğlu, 2006; Sürüç-Şen & İpek, 2020; Şallı-Çopur, 2008; Varol, 2018). As a result, we can infer that they were dissatisfied with the online microteaching courses that were offered during the COVID-19 pandemic, which contrasts with earlier studies (Celen & Akcan, 2017; Sürüç-Şen & İpek, 2020), where positive impressions of their microteaching experiences were reported. It was believed that these online micro-teaching courses could not be conducted as effectively as they could have been in face-to-face education

because neither the teacher educators nor these graduates were prepared for this change in the mode of education. As a result, the graduates in this study made the same recommendation made by Özkahya (2019) to increase the program's practice component. Throughout the interviews, they emphasised the value of having a solid command of spoken and English language knowledge as essential teacher competencies for English language instructors. However, they also mentioned in the interviews that some of their peers struggled with English even in their senior year. These results are consistent with earlier research, which highlighted the importance of English language teachers' speaking abilities and language skills courses in the programme (Erozan, 2003; Şallı-Çopur, 2008; Varol, 2018). As a result, they emphasised the need to give language component courses more weight, which is consistent with the conclusions made by Bilican (2016). The language skills courses in the second term should be more advanced in terms of content. Along with this, pre-service teachers should be trained to be autonomous language learners through language learning strategies and extramural activities like watching TV series which would ultimately foster motivation (Feraco et al., 2022) and their self-regulated learning (Guilmette et al., 2019).

The program's elements were also assessed by the graduates for their contribution to the growth of these teacher competencies. The results confirmed what previous studies (Bilican, 2016; Şallı-Çopur, 2008; Varol, 2018) had found to be true: ELT methodology courses are very effective at helping students improve their competencies in lesson planning, assessment, classroom management, and professional development. Even though most of the courses in this component were taken online, they were still found to be effective. This conclusion is supported by comments made by graduates who described the ELT methodology courses as "the bedrock" and "the keystones" of the programme. According to earlier studies (Celen & Akcan, 2017; Karslı, & Yağız, 2022), the Teaching Practice courses contributed most to the graduates' competencies, as evidenced by the highest mean score they received. Additionally, it was discovered that language and linguistics components were more successful than general education and literature components. Their knowledge of the English language and the way they explain grammar rules and word formation are both influenced by linguistics courses, which supports the findings of Hatipoğlu (2017). The graduates indicated that the language skills course served as a model for lesson planning. Contrary to what Varol (2018) found, general education courses were reportedly not a significant contributor to their teaching and lesson planning. This finding can be surprising when we consider that such courses aim to equip pre-service teachers with the pedagogical knowledge by touching upon topics including cognitive developmental stages, learning difficulties, and principles and methods of instruction. While some graduates emphasised the value and effectiveness of general education courses, some graduates felt that these courses fell short due to the medium of instruction and the uninteresting course material. In the open-ended questions, they frequently mentioned areas for improvement in classroom management skills (effective voice use, time management, patience and tolerance for students, body language and posture, engaging and motivating students), which bears similarities with the earlier studies claiming that using time and voice effectively for instructional purposes were the aspects of classroom management that needed improvement (Eke & Razı, 2016; Gürbüz, 2006; Peacock, 2009). Additionally, contrary to earlier research (Uzun, 2016; Varol, 2018), many graduates stated that information and instructional technologies contributed to their teacher competencies. This finding can be context-specific because the way technological pedagogical competence is fostered may differ depending on the courses. As these graduates also experienced distance education first-hand as a learner and pre-service teacher, it is predictable that they would feel more tech-savvy. Regarding the literature courses, the results were contradictory in that some graduates claimed that these courses helped them improve their lesson planning abilities, while others claimed that they did not affect how they manage their classrooms or lesson planning. Although they added to their cultural knowledge, general culture courses were the least effective in this regard. The general culture courses did not significantly improve the graduates' teaching competencies, which explains why they had the lowest mean score among the six components. They let it be known that they did not like these courses by requesting that they be taught in English. It also supports the findings of Uzun (2015) that graduates were dissatisfied with the medium of instruction in general education and culture courses. He claimed that English pedagogical courses were more beneficial to pre-service teachers than Turkish

pedagogical courses. Additionally, regarding the 2006 programme, Çelik and Memduhoğlu (2022) concluded that the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and general culture courses in the English language teacher education programme are inadequate. The 2018 curriculum included nineteen elective courses in general culture, twenty-two professional, and eleven departmental courses. We can claim that this curriculum has a wide range of elective courses. Even though the graduates did not take all these elective courses and shared their projections about the possible contributions of these courses based on the limited number of elective courses they took, their dissatisfaction with the general culture courses was also attributed to the repetitive and uninteresting nature of the course content. As a result, just because there are many elective courses available does not mean that the graduates will necessarily benefit from them. In addition, one graduate recommended learning how to teach to the test, which can result from the negative washback of test-based assessment of language skills on their expectations from teacher education, which also confirms that the schooling norms intertwined with the national curriculum affect not only pre-service teacher development (Güngör & Güngör, 2019) but also in-service teacher development. They face a dilemma of choosing between teaching to the test and promoting learners' language proficiency. As can be inferred from the suggestion of the graduate, she deems teaching to the test as a must-have competence in ELTEP. Finally, a few graduates highlighted the significance of cultivating their emotional intelligence, which is also an area to be further improved and lacking in the 2018 curriculum. This also confirms the finding that soft skills were not included in the curriculum despite the high demand for these in real life (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). However, as pointed out by Zhao (2018), the changing paradigm in education requires teachers to have empathy and social-emotional competence as teachers' soft skills affect learners' well-being as well.

Based on these findings, the following suggestions can be offered with the aim of improving the ELTEP under evaluation:

1. The programme should offer more practical courses like microteaching starting from the second year on so that they would be prepared for their future practice.

2. The number of language-related courses should be increased, and the quality and content of these courses should be designed to foster language skills. Additionally, course instructors can train learners to be autonomous language learners by teaching them the relevant learning strategies. Thus, they can keep honing their language skills outside the walls of the classroom.

3. Regarding the linguistics component, the instructor should also share their experiences instead of only lecturing. I believe this should be the case in all the courses offered by the faculty because the teacher candidates can benefit from such experience-based anecdotes.

4. Regarding literature courses, one recommendation is to include "Mythology" courses into the curriculum as a compulsory course. The emphasis in these courses is expected to be more on how to teach language through literary texts.

5. Overall, the diversity in elective courses can be increased, as these were deemed repetitive in terms of content.

6. General education and culture courses should be conducted in English. The number of general education and culture courses was suggested to be decreased because their content was almost the same as the compulsory general education courses.

7. More focus on special and inclusive education was recommended by the graduates.

8. The graduates' suggestion is to conduct the general culture courses in four weeks and move on to another course because they generally do not have such intensive content that they can be conducted in a 14-week semester.

9. Including courses on emotional intelligence can also help teacher candidates hone their soft skills.

10. The student selection system should be redesigned in that if the students are not qualified to be a teacher, then there is no meaning in providing a quality education because they will not be putting that education into practice anyway. We can refer to the English language teacher candidate selection process proposed by Erdoğan and Savaş (2022).

To conclude, there were some aspects to be maintained (ELT methodology components) and those that need improvement (i.e., more practice opportunities, general culture, and education courses) in the ELTEP. One last remark worth mentioning is that the centralised curriculum has been criticised as it is designed in a top-down manner (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019) and is deemed as the main reason for the candidate teachers' being passive technicians (Tezgiden-Cakcak, 2015). Therefore, it did not meet the needs of prospective language teachers. Türkiye is among the countries that provide schools with the least authority in terms of curriculum planning, according to an OECD report (2013). However, in 2020, just like Öztürk and Aydın (2019) suggested, HEC gave the authority to the faculties of education to redesign their curriculum. This leaves us with the following questions in our minds: "Will designing our curriculum be successful in meeting the needs of the local contexts?", "Will this new curriculum foster prospective language teachers' teacher competencies more than the previous ones?", "Will this curriculum redesign help prospective language teachers to be reflective practitioners or even transformative intellectuals, unlike the previous centralised curriculum?". These questions call for further research on the ELTE programmes designed by the respective higher education institutions across Türkiye in the upcoming years.

4.2. Evaluating the evaluation

Two questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were used in this PE to assess the ELTEP from the perspective of the graduates. These tools allowed the graduates to assess the six programme components and concentrate on both the program's strengths and areas for improvement.

Each tool gave us a unique perspective on the ELTEP. The qualitative results, which were based on interviews and open-ended questions, provided support for the quantitative findings, and enabled us to do methodological triangulation. Regarding the researcher bias, as the primary researcher, I have been working in this institution as part of this programme for almost five years. Thus, I could provide an insider perspective while evaluating this programme. Nevertheless, by doing intercoder reliability, we attempted to ensure the credibility and validity of the findings. The programme had some elements and facets that they thought worked well, while other elements left them unsatisfied. Given that they only took a small portion of the elective courses—four general culture, six general education, and six departmental elective courses—it would be fair to say that the findings regarding the elective courses should be read with caution.

Twelve graduates' subjective evaluations make up the entirety of the evaluation. The PE is ideally intended to gather data through classroom observation and interviews with both the faculty and the graduates' employer to gather more objective data. But given our limited resources and time, we were only able to collect information from the graduates. This evaluation study is also constrained by the sociocultural environment of a foundation university. Because of this, results from a similar evaluation in a different context may differ. In conclusion, since 2018 curriculum has not yet been evaluated, this evaluation study is regarded as a significant contribution to the literature on language teacher education PE. This study may inspire other programme evaluation studies to be carried out on this curriculum or the newly designed ones in various settings.

Reference

Ataş, U., & Balıkçı, G. (2021). Linking theory and practice in an ELT program: An evaluation of materials, testing and practicum courses. *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies, 9*(17), 211-226.

Atmaca, Ç. (2019). ELT Sophomores' Evaluations on the Approaches and Methods Course. *European Journal of English Language Teaching, 5(*1), 12-31.

Bekereci-Şahin, M. (2022). Investigating Translation Courses at An Undergraduate EFL Teacher Education Program: Views of Instructors and Pre-Service Teachers. *European Journal of English Language Teaching, 7*(1), 31-46.

Bilican, R. (2016). *Effectiveness and Professional Competencies of English Language Teachers in First Five Years in Turkey* [Ph.D. Dissertation, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University].

Celen, K. M., & Akcan, S. (2017). Evaluation of an ELT practicum programme from the perspectives of supervisors, student teachers and graduates. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, *6*(3), 251-274.

CoHE. (2020). *Important decision on the transfer of authority from CoHE to education faculties*. CoHE. https://tinyurl.com/2p96bz9y

CoHE. (2018a). *Teacher Education Undergraduate Programmes*. CoHE. https://tinyurl.com/ywhv6k72

CoHE. (2018b). *English Language Teaching Undergraduate Programme*. CoHE. https://tinyurl.com/n6h753cp

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. Routledge Falmer.

Coşkun, A., & Daloğlu, A. (2010). Evaluating an English language teacher education program through Peacock's model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, *35*(6), 24-42.

Coşkun, A. (2016). Exploring the microteaching component of an EFL teacher education program. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 16*(3).810-829.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design - qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Çelik, S. N., & Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2022). The Evaluation of the English Language Teacher Education Program in Turkey. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, *8*(4), 833-851. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.8.4.833

Cepik, S., & Polat, N. (2014). Mandates, needs, equitable resources, and current research in English language teacher education: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 3*(2), 1-14.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press

Demir, Y. (2015). All or nothing: English as a foreign language (EFL) student teachers' and teacher trainers' reflections on a pre-service English teacher education program in Turkey. *The Anthropologist*, *19*(1), 157-165. https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891650

Eke, V. E., & Razı, S. (2016, May 12-14). *Pre-service teachers' perceptions on the contribution of EFL teacher education programme to their teaching skills* [Paper Presentation]. 9th International ELT Research Conference "Interdisciplinary Approaches: Beyond the Borders of ELT Methodology". Çanakkale, Türkiye.

Erdoğan, P., & Savaş, P. (2022). Investigating the selection process for initial English teacher education: Turkey. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *110*, 103581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103581

Erozan, F. (2005). *Evaluating the language improvement courses in the undergraduate ELT curriculum at Eastern Mediterranean University: A case stud*y [Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Middle East Technical University].

Feraco, T., Resnati, D., Fregonese, D., Spoto, A., & Meneghetti, C. (2022). Soft skills and extracurricular activities sustain motivation and self-regulated learning at school. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *90*(3), 550-569. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2021.1873090

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2011). *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*, (4th ed.). Pearson

Freeman, D. (1996). The 'unstudied problem': research on teacher learning in language teaching. In Freeman, D. & Richards, J.C. (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 351–78). Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(1), 397–417. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588114

Grosse, C. U. (1991). The TESOL methods course. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(1), 29–49. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587027

Guilmette, M., Mulvihill, K., Villemaire-Krajden, R., & Barker, E. T. (2019). Past and present participation in extracurricular activities is associated with adaptive self-regulation of goals, academic success, and emotional wellbeing among university students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *73,* 8-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.04.006

Güngör, M. N., & Güngör, M. A. (2019). Pre-service English language teachers' collaborative development: The emergence of research, rehearsal and reflection (3R) model from an activity theory perspective. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(1), 98-115. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2018.1545016

Gürbüz, N. (2006). Differing perceptions of pre-service English teachers' strengths and weaknesses in the practicum: A case study in Turkey. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 9, 39-46.

Gürel, E., & Aslan, B. (2022, October). A Systematic Review of Pre-service English Language Teacher Education Program Literature: 2004-2021. *ICCI EPOK 2022-10th International Congress on Curriculum and Instruction*, Gazi University, Ankara.

Gürler, İ. (2018). *Evaluation of the Current Curriculum in ELT Departments from the Perspectives of Lecturers and Students: A Needs Analysis* [Ph.D. dissertation, Atatürk University].

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2017). Linguistics courses in pre-service foreign language teacher training programs and knowledge about language. *ELT Research Journal, 6*(1), 45-68.

Hişmanoğlu, S. (2012). Prospective EFL teachers' views on English language teacher training program. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching, 1*(2), 330-341.

Karabuğa, F. (2016). The perspectives of both pre-service teachers and their educators on EFL teacher education programs in Turkey. *International Journal of Language Academy*, *4*(1), 331-347. http://dx.doi.org/10.18033/ijla.350

Karakaş, A. (2012). Evaluation of the English language teacher education program in Turkey. *ELT Weekly*, *4*(15), 1-16.

Karslı, V., & Yağız, O. (2022). Examination of the Pre-service Teachers' Experiences and Perceptions on Teaching Practices: English Language Teaching Case. *Arab World English Journal, 13*(2), 73-90. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.6

Kazaz, İ. (2022). *An Evaluation of Online Practicum Courses for Pre-Service English Language Teachers: Expectations, Attitudes, and Learning* [Ph.D. Dissertation, Hacettepe University].

Kiely, R., & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program Evaluation in Language Education*. Palgrave McMillan.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook,* (2nd edt.). Sage Publications.

MoNE. (2017). *Öğretmenlik Mesleği Genel Yeterlilikleri* [Generic Teacher Competencies]. MoNE. https://tinyurl.com/msczwc6t

OECD. (2013). *What makes schools successful? Resources, policies and practices* (Vol. IV). OECD. https://tinyurl.com/y7m88m4r

Özkahya, F. Z. (2019). *An Investigation into Profile of ELT Teacher Education Programmes in Turkey* [Master's thesis, Hacettepe University].

Öztürk, G., & Aydın, B. (2019). English language teacher education in Turkey: Why do we fail and what policy reforms are needed? *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International, 9*(1), 181-213. https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.520842

Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, *13*(3), 259-278. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809104698

Rea-Dickins, P., & Germaine, K.P. (1998). The price of everything and the value of nothing: trends in language programme evaluation. In Rea-Dickins, P. and Germaine, K.P. (Eds.), *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: building bridges* (pp. 3–19). Longman.

Robinson, B. (2003). Evaluation, research and quality. In Robinson, B. and Latchem, C. (Eds.), *Teacher education through open and distance learning* (pp. 193–211). Routledge Farmer.

Salihoğlu, U. M. (2012). Pre-service teachers' and their instructors' beliefs on the effectiveness of an English language teacher education program. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 3440-3444.

Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education programme in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *32*(4), 369-378. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470600981953

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Sage Publications.

Sürüç-Şen, N., & İpek, H. (2020). Perceptions on an EFL teacher education program: Voices from teacher candidates. *Language Teaching and Educational Research (LATER), 3*(1), 136-148. https://doi.org/10.35207/later.643694

Şallı-Çopur, D. (2008). *Teacher effectiveness in initial years of service: A case study on the graduates of METU foreign language education program* [Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Middle East Technical University].

Tezgiden-Cakcak, S. Y. (2015). *Preparing teacher candidates as passive technicians, reflective practitioners or transformative intellectuals* [Ph.D. Dissertation, Middle East Technical University].

Uztosun, M. S., & Troudi, S. (2015). Lecturers' views of curriculum change at English Language Teaching departments in Turkey. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 9*(1), 15-29.

Uzun, L. (2016). The educational and technical courses in the ELT program in Turkey: Do they contribute to ICT skills? *Cogent Education*, *3*(1), 1141454. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1141454

Uzun, L. (2015). The pedagogical courses in the ELT program in Turkish higher education: How efficient are they. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, *5*(4), 777-789.

Varol, B. (2018). Evaluation of an English Language Teacher Education Program from Student Teachers' Perspectives: A Case from Turkey. *International Journal of Field Education*, *4*(2), 83-96.

Yavuz, A. & Topkaya, E. Z. (2013). Teacher educators' evaluation of the English language teaching program: A Turkish case. *Novitas-ROYAL, 7*(1), 64-83.

Yavuz, A. (2018). The Meaning of Research: Perceptions and Experiences of English Language Teaching (ELT) Students Regarding the 'Research Skills' Course. *Journal of Social Sciences of Muş Alparslan University, 6*(2),247-255. http://dx.doi.org/10.18506/anemon.311165

Zhao, Y. (2018). The changing context of teaching and implications for teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 93*(3), 295-308. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2018.1449896

APPENDICES

Appendix-1. ELTE Programme

1st Term	2nd Term
Principles Of Atatürk And History Of Revolution	Principles Of Atatürk And History Of Revolution 2
Introduction To Educational Sciences	Educational Psychology
Educational Sociology	Educational Philosophy
Reading Skills 1	Reading Skills 2
Oral Communication Skills 1	Oral Communication Skills 2
Writing Skills 1	Writing Skills 2
Listening And Pronunciation 1	Listening And Pronunciation 2
Foreign Language 1	Foreign Language 2
Information Technologies	Structure Of English
Turkish Language 1	Turkish Language 2

3rd Term	4th Term
Professional Knowledge Elective Course 1 Principles And Methods Of Instruction	Professional Knowledge Elective Course 2
Instructional Technologies	Research Methods In Education
Departmental Elective Course 1	History Of Turkish Education
English Literature I	Departmental Elective Courses 2
Linguistics I	English Literature II
Approaches To English Language Learning And Teaching	Linguistics II
Critical Reading And Writing	English Language Teaching Programs
General Culture Elective 1	Language Acquisition
	General Culture Elective 2

5th Term	6th Term
Professional Knowledge Elective Course 3 Classroom Management	Professional Knowledge Elective Course 4
Ethics And Morality In Education	Measurement And Evaluation In Education
Departmental Elective Courses 3	Turkish Educational System And School Management
Teaching Foreign Language To Young Learners 1	Departmental Elective Course 4
Teaching Language And Literature 1	Teaching Foreign Language To Young Learners 2
Teaching English Language Skills 1	Teaching Language And Literature 2
General Culture Elective 3	Teaching English Language Skills 2
	General Culture Elective 4

7th Term	8th Term
Professional Knowledge Elective Course 5	Professional Knowledge Elective Course 6
Special Education And Mainstream	Guidance At Schools
Departmental Elective Course 5	Departmental Elective Course 6
Course Content Development In Elt	English Language Testing And Assessment
Translation	Teaching Practice II
Teaching Practice I	
Community Service	

Appendix-2. Sample Coding for Qualitative Data

Code (Classroom management)	Sample Quotation(s)
Time management	*Sometimes I also have problems with time management due to my desire to deal with students.* (Q, P9)
Being patient	*I guess I have to learn to be more patient, especially with young children.* (Q,P5)
Using voice effectively	*I need to develop the volume of my voice in the class.* (Q, P6)
Classroom management	"*A classroom management for sure. Yeah, because, like even if we were four people in the classroom when the teacher was absent back then, we couldn't manage the classroom at all. And yes, I mean, even in the classroom the there's still this coming late to the classroom, for example, look and they they they get distracted so much*" I1
Anticipating potential issues	*Anticipating potential issues* (Q, P4)
Engaging learners	*To make students engaged in the lesson from the start to end and make them feel as though the time was running out so fast.* (Q, P3)
Improving body language (i.e. posture)	*I should fix my posture.* (Q, P6)
How to motivate learners	*I should be motivating students more often, sometimes I get frustrated and do not try to motivate them.* (Q, P8)
Being tolerant towards young learners	*I should be more understanding to the students. Since I teach 1st grade sometimes when they don't listen I get mad easily and raise my voice* (QP8)

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

1. GİRİŞ

İngilizce'nin "ortak dil" olarak yükselişi (Crystal, 1997), İngilizce öğretmenleri yetiştirmenin önemini artırırken İngilizce öğretmeni yetiştirme programlarının eleştirel bir şekilde değerlendirilmesine dikkat çekmektedir. Program değerlendirme, ortaya çıkan öğretim talepleriyle uyumun sağlanması açısından çok önemli bir konu olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Türkiye'de Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) tarafından yönetilen İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programları 1997-1998, 2006-2007, 2018-2019 ve 2020 yıllarında reformlara tabii olmuştur. Ancak 2018 İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Program üzerine henüz program değerlendirilme çalışması yapılmamıştır. YÖK, 2020 reformu ile İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Program tasarım yetkisini eğitim fakültelerine devretmiştir. Bu sebeple bu çalışma 2018 İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programını program değerlendirmesine tabii tutup programın yeniden tasarımı konusunda bilinçli kararlar alınmasını sağlamak konusunda önemli çıkarımlar sunabilir. Bu çalışma Ankara'daki bir vakıf üniversitesinde 2018 yılından beri uygulanmakta olan İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programına odaklanmaktadır. Program değerlendirmesi mezun geri bildirimleri yoluyla programın güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini keşfetmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Programın değerlendirme çalışmasının iki amacı vardır. Amaçlardan biri vakıf üniversitesinde yürütülen İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programı'nın güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini keşfederek programın nasıl geliştirilebileceği konusunda ilgili paydaşlardan geri bildirim almak ve İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programını yeniden tasarlarken doğru kararlar alabilmek için geri bildirim sağlamaktır. Bu amaçla bu çalışmada aşağıdaki sorular incelenmektedir:

1. Mezunlara göre İngilizce Öğretmenliği programının hangi yönleri sürdürülmelidir?

2. Mezunlara göre İngilizce Öğretmenliği programının hangi yönleri geliştirilmelidir?

2. YÖNTEM

Bu araştırma, bir vakıf üniversitesindeki İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programına odaklanan durum çalışmasıdır. Mezunların algılarını belirlemek için Peacock'un (2009) tavsiyesine uygun olarak hem niteliksel hem de niceliksel yaklaşımlar kullanılarak veriler anketler ve görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır.

Araştırmanın evrenini, bir vakıf üniversitesinin 2018 müfredatını 2022 yılında tamamlayan 35 mezun oluşturmuştur. İngilizce öğretmeni olarak çalışan 14 mezun çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katkıda bulunmuştur. Veriler çevrim içi yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler ve Google Formlar aracılığıyla paylaşılan iki anket aracılığıyla toplanmıştır.

Şallı-Çopur'dan (2008) uyarlanan iki anket; mezunların yeterliliklerini, öğretme deneyimlerini ve ders değerlendirmelerini ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştır. İlk ankette demografik verileri, yeterlilikleri ve öğretimde karşılaşılan zorlukları kapsayan Likert tipi ölçeği kullanıldı. İkinci ankette ise Likert tipi maddeler ve açık uçlu sorular aracılığıyla mezunlar program derslerinin öğretmenlik becerilerine katkılarını değerlendirmiştir.

MS Teams aracılığıyla çevrim içi olarak gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerde Şallı-Çopur (2008)'dan uyarlanan görüşme protokolü kullanılmıştır. Görüşmeler ses kaydına alınmış, kelimesi kelimesine yazıya dökülmüş ve bu işlem ortalama 32 dakika sürmüştür.

Nicel veriler, SPSS sürüm 25 kullanılarak betimsel bir şekilde (ortalama, standart sapma, frekanslar ve yüzdeler) analiz edilmiştir. Nitel veriler, kodların kategorilere dönüştürülmesiyle sürekli karşılaştırmalı

analize tabi tutuldu. Hem nicel hem de nitel yöntemlerin kullanıldığı metodolojik üçgenleme, bulguların geçerliliğini artırmıştır (Cohen ve diğerleri, 2000). Örnek kodlama Ek 2'de verilmiştir.

Çalışmada etik hususlara bağlı kalınmakta, katılımcıların rızası alınmakta ve gizlilik için katılımcılara takma adlar verilmektedir. Nicel ve nitel analizleri birleştiren yöntem, araştırma bulgularının geçerliliğini ve kapsamlılığını güçlendirir.

3. BULGULAR, TARTIŞMA VE SONUÇ

Araştırmanın amacı, 2018 yılından bu yana uygulanan İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programı'ndan mezun olanların bakış açısından ilgili programı değerlendirmektir.

Öğretmen adayları daha önceki çalışmalarla tutarlı olarak dil ve konu alanı, materyal tasarımı ve ders planlama konularında yüksek yeterlilik göstermişlerdir (Bilican, 2016; Şallı-Çopur, 2008; Varol, 2018). Ancak mezunlar sınıf yönetimi ve ölçme ve değerlendirme becerilerinde zorluklar yaşadıklarını belirttiler. Bu tutarsızlık, Covid-19 salgını sırasında çevrimiçi mikro öğretime geçişle daha da kötüleşen sınırlı pratik deneyime bağlanabilir.

Mezunlar, daha önceki olumlu izlenimlerin aksine (Celen ve Akcan, 2017; Sürüç-Şen ve İpek, 2020), pandemi döneminde çevrim içi mikro öğretim derslerinden memnuniyetsizliklerini dile getirdiler. Bu değişim hem eğitimcileri hem de mezunları hazırlıksız yakaladı ve Özkahya'nın (2019) ortaya koyduğuyla uyumlu olarak programdaki pratik bileşenlerin artırılması ihtiyacını vurguladı.

Mezunlar, sağlam bir dilin ve İngilizce yeterliliğinin önemini vurguladılar ve ileri düzey dil becerileri derslerine ve öz yönlendirmeli öğrenme stratejilerine ihtiyaç duyulduğunu öne sürdüler. Bu durum, müfredatta dil bileşeni derslerine daha fazla ağırlık verilmesi vurgusuyla örtüşmektedir (Erozan, 2003; Şallı-Çopur, 2008; Varol, 2018).

İngiliz dili öğretimi yöntem derslerinin, çevrimiçi olarak yürütüldüğünde bile mezunların çeşitli alanlardaki yetkinliklerini destekleyerek etkili olduğu görülmüştür (Bilican, 2016; Şallı-Çopur, 2008; Varol, 2018). Öğretmenlik uygulaması dersleri önemli ölçüde katkı sağlarken (Çelen ve Akcan, 2017; Karslı ve Yağız, 2022), dilbilim derslerinin genel eğitim ve edebiyat bileşenlerinden daha çok katkıda bulunmuştur.

Mezunlar genel kültür derslerindeki iyileştirilmesi gereken yönlerin altını çizerek bu derslerin dilini İngilizce olması gerekliliğini ortaya koydular (Uzun, 2015). Bazıları genel eğitim derslerinin katkısını sorgulayarak uygulama fırsatlarının, özel eğitim odağının ve duygusal zekâ eğitiminin önemini vurguladı.

Bulgulara dayanarak, uygulamalı derslerin erken başlatılması, dil becerilerine yönelik derslere daha fazla odaklanılması, mitoloji dersinin programa dâhil edilmesi, seçmeli derslerin çeşitlendirilmesi ve genel eğitim ve kültür derslerinde öğretim dilinin İngilizce olması dâhil olmak üzere programın iyileştirilmesine yönelik çeşitli öneriler sunulmuştur. Mezunlar aynı zamanda duygusal zekâlarını geliştirebilecek derslerin gerekliliğine vurgu yapmıştır.

Sonuç olarak, İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Program'ında sürdürülmesi gereken bazı yönler (İngiliz dili öğretimi yöntem dersleri) ve iyileştirilmesi gereken hususlar (daha fazla uygulama fırsatı, genel kültür ve eğitim dersleri) vardı. Son olarak belirtilmesi gereken bir husus da merkezi müfredatın yukarıdan aşağıya tasarlanması nedeniyle eleştirilmesi (Öztürk ve Aydın, 2019) ve öğretmen adaylarının pasif teknisyen olmalarının temel nedeni olarak görülmesidir (Tezgiden-Cakcak, 2015). Bu nedenle dil öğretmeni adaylarının ihtiyaçlarını karşılamıyordu. OECD raporuna (2013) göre Türkiye, müfredat planlaması konusunda okullara en az yetki veren ülkeler arasında yer alıyor. 2020 yılında YÖK tarafından Eğitim Fakültelerine lisans programlarını tasarlama yetkisi bizi şu sorularla baş başa bırakmaktadır: "Müfredatımızı tasarlamak yerel bağlamların ihtiyaçlarını karşılamada başarılı olacak mı?", "Bu yeni müfredat, dil öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmen yeterliliklerini öncekilere göre daha fazla geliştirecek mi?", "Bu müfredatın yeniden tasarlanması, önceki merkezi müfredatın aksine, dil öğretmen adaylarının

yansıtıcı uygulayıcılar ve hatta dönüştürücü entelektüeller olmalarına yardımcı olacak mı?" Bu sorular Türkiye genelinde tasarlanan İngilizce Öğretmeni Yetiştirme Programları hakkında daha fazla araştırma yapılmasını gerektirmektedir.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

In this study, all the rules specified to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were complied with. None of the actions specified under the heading "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics", which is the second part of the directive, have been taken.

Ethics Committee Approval Information:

Ethical committee: Social and Humanities Scientific Research and Art Field Ethics Committee

Data of ethical approval: 23.05.2023

The number of ethical approval: 17162298.600-145

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

The contribution rate of the 1st author to the research is 60%, and the contribution rate of the 2nd author to the research is 40%. In addition, the contributions of each researcher to the stages of the research are as follows:

Author 1: Research design, data collection and analysis, reporting.

Author 2: Research design, Determination of the method, consultancy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to the graduates who contributed to our study and to my colleague who contributed to the reliability analysis.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.